

A generalized quantum Slepian-Wolf

Anurag Anshu* Rahul Jain† Naqeeb Ahmad Warsi‡

April 24, 2017

Abstract

In this work we consider a quantum generalization of the task considered by Slepian and Wolf [1] regarding distributed source compression. In our task Alice, Bob, Charlie and Referee share a joint pure state. Alice and Bob wish to send a part of their respective systems to Charlie without collaborating with each other. We give achievability bounds for this task in the one-shot setting and provide asymptotic analysis in the case when there is no side information with Charlie.

Our result implies the result of Abeyesinghe, Devetak, Hayden and Winter in [2] who studied a special case of this problem. As another special case wherein Bob holds trivial registers, we recover the result of Devetak and Yard [3] regarding quantum state redistribution.

1 Introduction

In information theory, one of the most fundamental problems is the task of source-compression. The answer to this problem was given by Shannon in his celebrated work [4]. Slepian and Wolf, in their work [1], studied this task in the distributed network setting, which consists of three parties Alice ($X_1, X_2 \dots X_n$), Bob ($Y_1, Y_2 \dots Y_n$) and Charlie, where $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots (X_n, Y_n)$ are pairs of independent and identically distributed correlated random variables. The goal here is that Alice needs to communicate $(X_1, X_2, \dots X_n)$ to Charlie and similarly, Bob needs to communicate $(Y_1, Y_2, \dots Y_n)$ to Charlie. Furthermore, Alice and Bob do not collaborate. From Shannon's result, one can easily see that the amount of total communication needed to accomplish this task is $nH(X) + nH(Y)$. However, the surprising feature of the result of Slepian and Wolf is that the amount of total communication only needs to be $nH(XY)$. Furthermore, their result implies that there is a trade-off on the amount of communication between (Alice, Charlie) and (Bob, Charlie).

The quantum version of this problem was studied by Abeyesinghe, Devetak, Hayden and Winter in [2]. In this setting, there are four parties, Alice (M), Bob (N), Charlie and Referee (R), where Referee serves as a purifying system for Alice and Bob. The goal is that Alice needs to communicate the register M to Charlie and Bob needs to communicate the register N to Charlie, such that the final quantum state between Referee and Charlie is close to the original pure state between Referee, Alice and Bob. The work [2] studied above task in the asymptotic and i.i.d setting. The authors introduced a protocol termed *Fully Quantum Slepian-Wolf* and combined it with Schumacher's compression [5] (using the notion of *time-sharing*) to obtain a rate pair.

The emerging framework of one-shot information theory is providing a new perspective on data compression and channel coding and is also relevant in the practical scenarios. This framework also provides insights into the conceptual details of information theoretic protocols, as the notational complications arising due to many copies of the state are no longer present (although we note that asymptotic and i.i.d setting also has its own conveniences). One-shot information theory also has found applications in both classical communication complexity [6, 7] and quantum communication complexity [8]. Many quantum tasks have been formulated in their one-shot setting, such as quantum state merging ([9, 10], originally introduced in [11]) and quantum state redistribution ([12, 13, 14], originally introduced in [3, 15]).

*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore. a0109169@u.nus.edu

†Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore and MajuLab, UMI 3654, Singapore. rahul@comp.nus.edu.sg

‡Centre for Quantum Technologies and SPMS, NTU, Singapore and IIITD, Delhi. warsi.naqeeb@gmail.com

Given the importance of one-shot information theory, in this work we consider the one-shot version of the problem studied in [2]. To capture a more general scenario, along with the registers M, N we also allow Alice, Bob and Charlie to have additional registers A, B, C respectively. Thus, our setting is as follows, depicted in Figure 1.

Task: Alice (AM), Bob (BN), Charlie (C) and Referee (R) share a joint pure quantum state. The goal is that Alice needs to communicate the register M to Charlie and Bob needs to communicate the register N to Charlie, such that the final quantum state between Referee (R), Alice (A), Bob (B) and Charlie (CMN) is close to the original pure state between the parties. We allow pre-shared entanglement between (Alice, Charlie) and (Bob, Charlie) respectively.

This task is a natural generalization of the aforementioned task and also extends the well studied problem of quantum state redistribution [3, 15]. A special case when A is trivial was considered by [16] in which they studied the trade-off between amount of *entanglement consumed* between Alice and Charlie and communication between Bob and Charlie.




Figure 1: Alice (AM), Bob (BN), Charlie (C) and Referee (R) share a joint pure quantum state Ψ . The goal is that Alice needs to communicate the register M to Charlie and Bob needs to communicate the register N to Charlie, such that the final quantum state Ψ' between Referee (R), Alice (A), Bob (B) and Charlie (CMN) is close to the original pure state between the parties. Shared entanglement is allowed only between (Alice, Charlie) and (Bob, Charlie) respectively.

Our Results: Our one shot result is mentioned as Theorem 2. We emphasize on two main ingredients: first is that the rate region appears in terms of max-relative entropy and hypothesis testing relative entropy. Second ingredient is that the rate region is a union of a family of rate regions, each characterized by a quantum state that is close to original state Ψ and satisfies some max-relative entropy constraints.

Using this, we are able to obtain the following rate region in the asymptotic i.i.d setting when C is trivial:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} (I(RAB : M) - I(A : M)), \\ R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} (I(RAB : N) - I(B : N)), \\ R_{A \rightarrow C} + R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} (I(RAB : M : N) - I(A : M) - I(B : N)), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{A \rightarrow C}$ is the rate of quantum communication from Alice to Charlie, $R_{B \rightarrow C}$ is the rate of quantum communication from Bob to Charlie and all the information theoretic quantities calculated above are with respect to the state Ψ_{RABMN} shared between Alice, Bob and Referee. Note that we have used a tri-partite version of mutual information, formally defined in Section 2.

An immediate consequence of the above result is the rate pair obtained for the task considered in [2], with registers A, B being trivial. Moreover, if registers B, N are trivial in the original task, then the task reduces to that of quantum state redistribution. In this case, the result of Theorem 2 also reproduces the bound given in [3, 15] for quantum state redistribution in asymptotic and i.i.d. setting.

Techniques: Along with the inherent challenges of one-shot information theory, an additional challenge for extending the result of [2] is the absence of the notion of time sharing in the one-shot case. The idea of time-sharing is as follows: given two rates $R = (R_1, R_2)$ and $R' = (R'_1, R'_2)$ at which Alice and Bob can communicate to Charlie, one can construct a protocol which achieves the rate $\alpha R + (1 - \alpha)R'$ by using the first protocol for the first αn copies and using the second protocol for the last $(1 - \alpha)n$ copies (see [17, Page 534]).

It is clear that this technique cannot extend to the one-shot setting which considers just one copy of input state. We overcome the obstacle of time sharing in the one-shot case by using the technique of *convex-split* [13] along with *position-based decoding* [18]. The convex-split technique allows one party to prepare a convex combination of states on the registers of other party, if the first party holds a purification of the registers of the second party. The concept of position-based decoding is essentially hypothesis testing on a global state.

Technical contribution of this work resides in two aspects. First is that we prove a new version of convex-split lemma [13, Page 3], which we refer to as *tri-partite* convex-split lemma, which requires Charlie to prepare a convex combination of quantum states shared between three parties Referee, Alice and Bob. We prove the sufficient conditions which allow Charlie to prepare such convex combination with small error. Second technical contribution is in our asymptotic analysis of the one-shot bounds. It can be seen that the time-sharing technique, along with the quantum state redistribution protocol of [3, 15], obtains the asymptotic achievability result mentioned above¹. Since our one-shot result has no time-sharing involved, we provide an explicit analysis of our bound when there are many independent copies of the state Ψ shared between the parties, in the case where register C is absent. For this, we exploit several properties of the quantum information spectrum relative entropy (introduced in [19, 20]; the classical information spectrum approach originated in [21]) to show the existence of a quantum state that is close to the original state Ψ and satisfies several max-entropy constraints on the reduced systems (given explicitly in the statement of Theorem 3). A special case of this analysis has also appeared in the context of quantum channel coding for broadcast channel in our work [18], suggesting a wide applicability of the techniques developed in the proof of Theorem 3.

Organization

We provide our notations and useful facts in the Section 2. We discuss our achievability protocol in Section 3 and the asymptotic bounds in Section 4. We prove the tri-partite version of convex-split lemma in Appendix A and give details of the asymptotic analysis in Appendix B.

2 Quantum information theory

Consider a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ endowed with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (in this paper, we only consider finite dimensional Hilbert-spaces). The ℓ_1 norm of an operator X on $\mathcal{H}$ is $\|X\|_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr} \sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ and ℓ_2 norm is $\|X\|_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\text{Tr} X X^\dagger}$. A quantum state (or a density matrix or a state) is a positive semi-definite matrix on $\mathcal{H}$ with trace equal to 1. It is called *pure* if and only if its rank is 1. A sub-normalized state is a positive semi-definite matrix on $\mathcal{H}$ with trace less than or equal to 1. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a unit vector on $\mathcal{H}$, that is $\langle \psi, \psi \rangle = 1$. With some abuse of notation, we use ψ to represent the state and also the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, associated with $|\psi\rangle$. Given a quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, *support of ρ* , called $\text{supp}(\rho)$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ spanned by all eigen-vectors of ρ with non-zero eigenvalues.

A *quantum register* A is associated with some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. Define $|A| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Let $\mathcal{L}(A)$ represent the set of all linear operators on $\mathcal{H}_A$. Let $\mathcal{P}(A)$ represent the set of all positive semidefinite operators on $\mathcal{H}_A$. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(A)$, the set of quantum states on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. State ρ with subscript A indicates $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. If two registers A, B are associated with the same Hilbert space, we shall represent the relation by $A \equiv B$. Composition of two registers A and B , denoted AB , is associated with

¹The extremal points of the rate region are $(R_{A \rightarrow C}, R_{B \rightarrow C}) = (\frac{1}{2}I(RB : M|NC), \frac{1}{2}I(RAM : N|C))$ and $(R_{A \rightarrow C}, R_{B \rightarrow C}) = (\frac{1}{2}I(RBN : M|C), \frac{1}{2}I(RA : N|MC))$. The first can be achieved by Bob sending N to Charlie using quantum state redistribution, followed by Alice sending M to Charlie, again using quantum state redistribution. Second can be achieved in analogous fashion. Any rate pair can then be achieved by time sharing between these two protocols.

Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. For two quantum states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(B)$, $\rho \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ represents the tensor product (Kronecker product) of ρ and σ . The identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$ (and associated register A) is denoted I_A . For any operator O on $\mathcal{H}_A$, we denote by $\{O\}_+$ the subspace spanned by non-negative eigenvalues of O and by $\{O\}_-$ the subspace spanned by negative eigenvalues of O . For a positive semidefinite operator $M \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, the largest and smallest non-zero eigenvalues of M are denoted by $\lambda_{\max}(M)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(M)$, respectively.

Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$. We define

$$\rho_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}_A \rho_{AB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i (\langle i| \otimes I_B) \rho_{AB} (|i\rangle \otimes I_B),$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. The state $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ is referred to as the marginal state of ρ_{AB} . Unless otherwise stated, a missing register from subscript in a state will represent partial trace over that register. Given a $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, a *purification* of ρ_A is a pure state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ such that $\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \rho_A$. Purification of a quantum state is not unique.

A quantum map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(B)$ is a completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) linear map (mapping states in $\mathcal{D}(A)$ to states in $\mathcal{D}(B)$). A *unitary* operator $U_A : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $U_A^\dagger U_A = U_A U_A^\dagger = I_A$. An *isometry* $V : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ is such that $V^\dagger V = I_A$ and $V V^\dagger = I_B$. The set of all unitary operations on register A is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(A)$.

Definition 1. We shall consider the following information theoretic quantities. Reader is referred to [22, 23, 24, 25, 26] for many of these definitions. We consider only normalized states in the definitions below. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

1. **Fidelity** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$F(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\sqrt{\rho_A} \sqrt{\sigma_A}\|_1.$$

For classical probability distributions $P = \{p_i\}, Q = \{q_i\}$,

$$F(P, Q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i \sqrt{p_i \cdot q_i}.$$

2. **Purified distance** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$P(\rho_A, \sigma_A) = \sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho_A, \sigma_A)}.$$

3. **ε -ball** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho'_A \in \mathcal{D}(A) \mid P(\rho_A, \rho'_A) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

4. **Von-Neumann entropy** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$S(\rho_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A).$$

5. **Relative entropy** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A) - \text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \sigma_A).$$

6. **Max-relative entropy** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$D_{\max}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : 2^\lambda \sigma_A \geq \rho_A\}.$$

7. **Smooth max-relative entropy** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\rho'_A \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A)} D_{\max}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A).$$

8. **Smooth min-relative entropy** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$,

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{0 < \Pi < I, \text{Tr}(\Pi \rho_A) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2} \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma_A)} \right).$$

9. **Information spectrum relative entropy** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{R : \text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \sigma_A\}_+) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

10. **Information spectrum relative entropy [Alternate definition]** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$\tilde{D}_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{R : \text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \sigma_A\}_-) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

11. **Mutual information** For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$,

$$I(A : B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) = D(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_A \otimes \rho_B).$$

12. **Tri-partite mutual information** For $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{D}(ABC)$,

$$I(A : B : C)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_C) - S(\rho_{ABC}) = D(\rho_{ABC} \| \rho_A \otimes \rho_B \otimes \rho_C).$$

We will use the following facts.

Fact 1 (Triangle inequality for purified distance, [24]). For states $\rho_A, \sigma_A, \tau_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$P(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \leq P(\rho_A, \tau_A) + P(\tau_A, \sigma_A).$$

Fact 2 (Monotonicity under quantum operations, [27],[28]). For quantum states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, and quantum operation $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) : \mathcal{L}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(B)$, it holds that

$$D_{\max}(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \| \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq D_{\max}(\rho \| \sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad F(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \geq F(\rho, \sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad D_H^\varepsilon(\rho \| \sigma) \geq D_H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \| \mathcal{E}(\sigma)).$$

In particular, for bipartite states $\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, it holds that

$$D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}) \geq D_{\max}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \quad \text{and} \quad F(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) \leq F(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \quad \text{and} \quad D_H^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}) \geq D_H^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A).$$

Fact 3 (Uhlmann's Theorem, [29]). Let $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ be a purification of ρ_A and $|\sigma\rangle_{AC} \in \mathcal{D}(AC)$ be a purification of σ_A . There exists an isometry $V : C \rightarrow B$ such that,

$$F(|\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{AB}, |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{AB}) = F(\rho_A, \sigma_A),$$

where $|\theta\rangle_{AB} = (I_A \otimes V)|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$.

Fact 4 (Pinsker's inequality, [30]). For quantum states $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$F(\rho, \sigma) \geq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}D(\rho \| \sigma)}.$$

Fact 5 (Triangle property of smooth max- relative entropy). For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A, \tau_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, it holds that

$$D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \tau_A) \leq D_{\max}(\sigma_A \| \tau_A) + D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A).$$

Proof. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}(\sigma_A \| \tau_A)$, which implies that $\sigma_A \leq 2^k \tau_A$. Let $\rho'_A \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A)$ be the state achieving the infimum in $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A)$. Then $\rho'_A \leq 2^R \sigma_A \leq 2^{R+k} \tau_A$. This implies that $D_{\max}(\rho'_A \| \tau_A) \leq R + k$, which concludes the fact using the inequality $D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \tau_A) \leq D_{\max}(\rho'_A \| \tau_A)$. $\square$

Fact 6 (Relating two definitions of information spectrum relative entropy). Fix an $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. For quantum state $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and operator $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, we have that

$$D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \leq \tilde{D}_s^{1-\varepsilon}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A).$$

Proof. Let R achieve the infimum in the definition of $\tilde{D}_s^{1-\varepsilon}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A)$. Thus, we have that $\text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \sigma_A\}_-) \geq \varepsilon$. But then $\text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \sigma_A\}_+) < 1 - \varepsilon$. From the fact that $\text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \sigma_A\}_+)$ is monotonically decreasing in R (as shown in [20], Equation 17), we conclude the proof. $\square$

Fact 7 (Gentle measurement lemma, [31, 32]). Let ρ be a quantum state and $0 < A < I$ be an operator. Then

$$F(\rho, \frac{A\rho A}{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) \geq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}.$$

Lemma 1. Consider a pure quantum state $|\rho\rangle_{ORA} = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_O |\rho^i\rangle_{RA}$ and an isometry $\mathcal{A} = \sum_i P_i \otimes |i\rangle_{O'}$, such that $0 < P_i < I_A$, $\sum_i P_i^2 = I_A$. Define the state $|\rho'\rangle_{ORAO'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_O |\rho^i\rangle_{RA} |i\rangle_{O'}$ and let $q_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(P_i^2 \rho_A^i)$. Then it holds that

$$F(\rho'_{ORAO'}, \mathcal{A}\rho_{ORA}\mathcal{A}^\dagger) \geq \sum_i p_i q_i.$$

Proof. Consider the state

$$\mathcal{A}|\rho\rangle_{ORA} = \sum_{i,j} \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_O (I_R \otimes P_j) |\rho^i\rangle_{RA} |j\rangle_{O'}.$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} F(\rho'_{ORAO'}, \mathcal{A}\rho_{ORA}\mathcal{A}^\dagger) &= |(\sum_i \sqrt{p_i} \langle i|_O \langle \rho^i|_{RA} \langle i|_{O'}) (\sum_{i,j} \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_O (I_R \otimes P_j) |\rho^i\rangle_{RA} |j\rangle_{O'})| \\ &= |\sum_i p_i \langle \rho^i|_{RA} (I_R \otimes P_i) |\rho^i\rangle_{RA}| \\ &= \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}(P_i \rho_A^i) \\ &\geq \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}(P_i^2 \rho_A^i), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $P_i^2 \preceq P_i$, which is implied by $P_i \preceq I_A$. This completes the proof by definition of q_i . $\square$

Fact 8 ([14]). Let ρ, σ be quantum states such that $P(\rho, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon$. Let $0 \leq \Pi \leq I$ be an operator such that $\text{Tr}(\Pi\rho) \geq 1 - \delta^2$. Then $\text{Tr}(\Pi\sigma) \geq 1 - (2\varepsilon + \delta)^2$. If $\delta = 0$, then $\text{Tr}(\Pi\sigma) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2$.

Fact 9 (Hayashi-Nagaoka inequality, [19]). Let $0 < S < I, T$ be positive semi-definite operators. Then

$$(S + T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} T (S + T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2(I - S) + 4T.$$

3 Achievable rate region for distributed quantum source compression with side information

Problem statement:

Task 1: There are four parties Alice, Bob, Charlie and Referee. Furthermore, Alice (AM), Bob (BN), Referee (R) and Charlie (C) share the joint pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RAMBNC}$. Alice and Bob wish to communicate their registers M and N to Charlie such that the final state shared between Alice (A), Bob (B), Referee (R) and Charlie (CMN) is Φ_{RAMBNC} with the property that $P(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \varepsilon$, where ε is an error parameter. To accomplish this task, Alice and Charlie are also allowed pre-shared entanglement. Similarly, Bob and Charlie are allowed the same. See Figure 1.

To accomplish Task 1, we will first consider a *time-reversed* version defined as follows.

Task 2: There are four parties Alice, Bob, Charlie and Referee. Furthermore, Alice (A), Bob (B), Referee (R) and Charlie (CMN) share the joint pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RAMBNC}$. Charlie wishes to communicate her register M to Alice and N to Bob such that the final state shared between Alice (AM), Bob (BN), Referee (R) and Charlie (C) is Φ_{RAMBNC} with the property that $P(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \varepsilon$, where ε is an error parameter. To accomplish this task, Alice and Charlie are also allowed pre-shared entanglement. Similarly, Bob and Charlie are allowed the same.

Main result: Achievable rate region for Task 2

Theorem 1. Fix $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta > 0$. Let Alice (A), Bob (B), Referee (R) and Charlie (CMN) share the pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RAMBNC}$. There exists an entanglement assisted quantum protocol with entanglement of the form $|\theta_1\rangle \otimes |\theta_2\rangle$ (where $|\theta_1\rangle$ is shared between Alice, Charlie in some registers E_{AC} and $|\theta_2\rangle$ is shared between Bob, Charlie in some registers E_{BC}), such that at the end of the protocol following properties hold.

- The global shared state is $|\Phi\rangle_{RAMBNC'E'_{AC}E'_{BC}}$ with R belonging to Referee, (AM) belonging to Alice, (BN) belonging to Bob, C belonging to Charlie, E'_{AC} belonging to (Alice, Charlie) and E'_{BC} belonging to (Bob, Charlie).
- There exist states $|\theta'_1\rangle_{E'_{AC}}$ and $|\theta'_2\rangle_{E'_{BC}}$ such that $P(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \otimes |\theta'_1\rangle\langle\theta'_1| \otimes |\theta'_2\rangle\langle\theta'_2|) \leq \varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2 + 2\sqrt{\delta}$.

The number of qubits that Charlie sends to Alice and Bob are $R_{C \rightarrow A}$ and $R_{C \rightarrow B}$ be respectively, where the pair $(R_{C \rightarrow A}, R_{C \rightarrow B})$ lie in the union of the following rate region: for every $\Psi'_{RAMBNC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi_{RAMBNC})$ such that $\Psi'_{RAB} \preceq 2^\delta \Psi_{RAB}$ and states σ_M, ω_N :

$$\begin{aligned} R_{C \rightarrow A} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RABM} \| \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \sigma_M) - D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M) + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^2 \delta} \right), \\ R_{C \rightarrow B} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RABN} \| \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \omega_N) - D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \omega_N) + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^2 \delta} \right), \\ R_{C \rightarrow A} + R_{C \rightarrow B} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RABMN} \| \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \sigma_M \otimes \omega_N) - D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \omega_N) + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^2 \delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We divide our proof into the following steps.

1. Quantum states and registers involved in the proof: Fix $\Psi'_{RAB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi_{RAB})$, states σ_M, ω_N and the pair $(R_{C \rightarrow A}, R_{C \rightarrow B})$ as mentioned in the lemma. Let $R_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2 \cdot R_{C \rightarrow A}$ and $R_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2 \cdot R_{C \rightarrow B}$. Let r_A, r_B be such that

$$r_A \leq D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M) + 2 \log \varepsilon_2, \quad r_B \leq D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \sigma_N) + 2 \log \varepsilon_2.$$

Let Π_{AM}^A and Π_{BN}^B be projectors achieving the optimum in the definitions of $D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M)$ and $D_H^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \sigma_N)$ respectively.

Introduce registers $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_{2R_A+r_A}$ such that for all i , $M_i \equiv M$ and $N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{2R_B+r_B}$ such that for all i , $N_i \equiv N$. For brevity, we define $\sigma^{-j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{2R_A+r_A}}$ and $\omega^{-k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega_{N_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{N_{k-1}} \otimes \omega_{N_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{N_{2R_B+r_B}}$. Consider the state,

$$\mu_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{R_A+r_A} \cdot 2^{R_B+r_B}} \sum_{j=1, k=1}^{2^{R_A+r_A}, 2^{R_B+r_B}} \Psi_{RABM_j N_k} \otimes \sigma^{-j} \otimes \omega^{-k}.$$

Note that $\Psi_{RAB} = \mu_{RAB}$. Consider the following purification of $\mu_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+r_A} 2^{R_B+r_B}}} \sum_{j=1, k=1}^{2^{R_A+r_A}, 2^{R_B+r_B}} |j, k\rangle_{JK} \otimes |\Psi\rangle_{RBACM_j N_k} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{M'_j} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{N'_k},$$

where

$$|\sigma^{-j}\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\sigma\rangle_{M'_1 M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{M'_{j-1} M_{j-1}} \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{M'_{j+1} M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{M'_{2R_A+r_A} M_{2R_A+r_A}}$$

and

$$|\omega^{-k}\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\omega\rangle_{N'_1 N_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |\omega\rangle_{N'_{k-1} N_{k-1}} \otimes |\omega\rangle_{N'_{k+1} N_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |\omega\rangle_{N'_{2R_B+r_B} N_{2R_B+r_B}}$$

and $\forall j \in [2^{R_A+r_A}] : |\sigma\rangle_{M'_j M_j}$ is a purification of σ_{M_j} and $\forall k \in [2^{R_B+r_B}] : |\omega\rangle_{N'_k N_k}$ is a purification of ω_{N_k} .

We decompose the register J into registers J_1, J_2 satisfying $|J_1| = 2^{R_A}, |J_2| = 2^{r_A}$. Similarly, we decompose the register K into registers K_1, K_2 satisfying $|K_1| = 2^{R_B}, |K_2| = 2^{r_B}$. Using this, we obtain the following state as a purification,

$$|\mu\rangle_{RABCJ_1J_2K_1K_2M'_1\dots M'_{2^{R_A+r_A}}N'_1\dots N'_{2^{R_B+r_B}}M_1\dots M_{2^{R_A+r_A}}N_1\dots N_{2^{R_B+r_B}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+r_A}2^{R_B+r_B}}} \times \sum_{j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2} |j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2\rangle_{J_1J_2K_1K_2} \otimes |\Psi\rangle_{RBACM_j N_k} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{M'_j} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{N'_k},$$

where, $j_1 \in [1 : 2^{R_A}], j_2 \in [1 : 2^{r_A}], k_1 \in [1 : 2^{R_B}], k_2 \in [1 : 2^{r_B}], j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (j_1 - 1)2^{r_A} + j_2, k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (k_1 - 1)2^{r_B} + k_2$. Henceforth, we shall take the convention that $j = (j_1 - 1)2^{r_A} + j_2, k = (k_1 - 1)2^{r_B} + k_2$, whenever it is clear from the context.

Now we introduce a subroutine protocol to be used in the actual protocol.

2. Subroutine protocol: Consider the following protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$:

1. Alice, Bob, Charlie and Referee start by sharing the state $|\mu\rangle$ between themselves where Alice holds registers $AM_1 \dots M_{2^{R_A+r_A}}$, Bob holds the registers $BN_1 N_2 \dots N_{2^{R_B+r_B}}$, Charlie holds the registers $CJ_1 J_2 K_1 K_2 M'_1 \dots M'_{2^{R_A+r_A}} N'_1 \dots N'_{2^{R_B+r_B}}$ and Referee holds the register R .
2. Charlie measures the registers J_1, K_1 and obtains the measurement outcome $j_1, k_1 \in [1 : 2^{R_A}] \times [1 : 2^{R_B}]$. He sends j_1 to Alice and j_2 to Bob using $\frac{R_A}{2}$ and $\frac{R_B}{2}$ qubits of respective quantum communication. Charlie, Alice and Bob employ superdense coding ([33]) using fresh entanglement to achieve this. Let the final registers obtained with Alice be J'_1 and with Bob be K'_1 .

- The global state at this step is

$$|\mu^{(2)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+r_A}2^{R_B+r_B}}} \sum_{j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2} |j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2\rangle_{J_1J_2K_1K_2} \otimes |j_1, k_1\rangle_{J'_1, K'_1} \otimes |\Psi\rangle_{RBACM_j N_k} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{M'_j} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{N'_k},$$

- For a fixed pair (j_1, k_1) , we define the state

$$|\mu^{(2)}_{(j_1, k_1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{r_A+r_B}}} \sum_{j_2, k_2} |j_2, k_2\rangle_{J_2K_2} \otimes |\Psi\rangle_{RBACM_j N_k} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{M'_j} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{N'_k}.$$

3. This is the hypothesis testing step. Conditioned on (j_1, k_1) , Alice and Bob consider the following operations. Let

$$\Pi_{j_2}^A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_{AM_j}^A \otimes I_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes I_{M_{j_2-1}} \otimes I_{M_{j_2+1}} \dots \otimes I_{M_{2^{R_A+r_A}}},$$

with $j = (j_1 - 1)2^{r_A} + j_2$ and $\Pi^A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j_2} \Pi_{j_2}^A$. Let

$$\Pi_{k_2}^B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_{BN_k}^B \otimes I_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes I_{M_{k_2-1}} \otimes I_{M_{k_2+1}} \dots \otimes I_{M_{2^{R_B+r_B}}},$$

with $k = (k_1 - 1)2^{r_B} + k_2$ and $\Pi^B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k_2} \Pi_{k_2}^B$. Alice applies the isometry $\mathcal{A} = \sum_{j_2} \sqrt{(\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j_2}^A (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \otimes$

$|j_2\rangle_{J'_2}$. Bob applies the isometry $\mathcal{B} = \sum_{k_2} \sqrt{(\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{k_2}^B (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \otimes |k_2\rangle_{K'_2}$.

Let the resulting global pure state be $|\mu^{(3)}\rangle$, which is the output of above protocol when it acts on the state $|\mu\rangle$. Let $|\mu^{(3)}_{(j_1, k_1)}\rangle$ be such that

$$|\mu^{(3)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+R_B}}} \sum_{j_1, k_1} |j_1, k_1\rangle_{J_1K_1} \otimes |j_1, k_1\rangle_{J'_1K'_1} \otimes |\mu^{(3)}_{(j_1, k_1)}\rangle.$$

Define the state

$$|\mu^{(4)}\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+r_A} 2^{R_B+r_B}}} \sum_{j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2} |j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2\rangle_{J_1 J_2 K_1 K_2} \otimes |j_1, k_1, j_2, k_2\rangle_{J'_1 K'_1 J'_2 K'_2} \\ \otimes |\Psi\rangle_{RBACM_j N_k} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{M'_j} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_{N'_k},$$

and let $|\mu_{(j_1, k_1)}^{(4)}\rangle$ be such that

$$|\mu^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+R_B}}} \sum_{j_1, k_1} |j_1, k_1\rangle_{J_1 K_1} \otimes |j_1, k_1\rangle_{J'_1 K'_1} \otimes |\mu_{(j_1, k_1)}^{(4)}\rangle.$$

We have the following claim, which says that Alice and Bob are able to generate $\mu^{(4)}$ with high fidelity.

Claim 1 (Hypothesis testing succeeds with high probability). *It holds that $F^2(\mu^{(3)}, \mu^{(4)}) \geq 1 - 12\varepsilon_2^2$.*

Proof. We shall prove that for every (j_1, k_1) , it holds that $F^2(\mu_{(j_1, k_1)}^{(3)}, \mu_{(j_1, k_1)}^{(4)}) \geq 1 - 12\varepsilon_2^2$, following which the claim is immediate. Appealing to symmetry, it is sufficient to consider the case $(j_1, k_1) = (1, 1)$, for which $j = j_2$ and $k = k_2$. Let $p_{\tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2 | j_2, k_2}$ be defined as follows:

$$p_{\tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2 | j_2, k_2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}((\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j_2}^A (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{k_2}^B (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{ABM_{j_2} N_{k_2}} \otimes \sigma^{-j_2} \otimes \omega^{-k_2}).$$

From Lemma 1, it holds that $F(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mu_{(1,1)}^{(2)}, \mu_{(1,1)}^{(4)}) \geq \frac{1}{2^{r_A+r_B}} \sum_{j_2, k_2} p_{j_2, k_2 | j_2, k_2}$. Since $\frac{1}{2^{r_A+r_B}} \sum_{j_2, k_2, \tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2} p_{\tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2 | j_2, k_2} = 1$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{2^{r_A+r_B}} \sum_{j_2, k_2} p_{j_2, k_2 | j_2, k_2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2^{r_A+r_B}} \sum_{j_2, k_2} \sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq j_2, \tilde{k}_2 \neq k_2} p_{\tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2 | j_2, k_2} = 1 - \sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq 1, \tilde{k}_2 \neq 1} p_{\tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2 | 1, 1},$$

where the last line follows by symmetry under interchange of registers M_{j_2}, N_{k_2} . We thus obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq 1, \tilde{k}_2 \neq 1} p_{\tilde{j}_2, \tilde{k}_2 | 1, 1} &= \text{Tr} \left(\left(\sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq 1} (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j_2}^A (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{\tilde{k}_2 \neq 1} (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{k_2}^B (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{ABM_1 N_1} \otimes \sigma^{-1} \otimes \omega^{-1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{a}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\left(\sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq 1} (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j_2}^A (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \otimes \text{I}_B \cdot |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{ABM_1 N_1} \otimes \sigma^{-1} \otimes \omega^{-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\text{I}_A \otimes \left(\sum_{\tilde{k}_2 \neq 1} (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{k_2}^B (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \cdot |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{ABM_1 N_1} \otimes \sigma^{-1} \otimes \omega^{-1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{b}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\left(2(\text{I}_A - \Pi_1^A) + 4 \sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq 1} \Pi_{j_2}^A \right) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{AM_1} \otimes \sigma^{-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\left(2(\text{I}_B - \Pi_1^B) + 4 \sum_{\tilde{k}_2 \neq 1} \Pi_{k_2}^B \right) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{BN_1} \otimes \omega^{-1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{c}{\leq} 2(\varepsilon_2^2) + 2 \cdot 2^{r_A - D_H^2(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M)} + 2 \cdot 2^{r_B - D_H^2(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \sigma_N)} \leq 6\varepsilon_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we use

$$\sum_{\tilde{j}_2 \neq 1} (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j_2}^A (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \preceq \sum_{\tilde{j}_2} (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j_2}^A (\Pi^A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \text{I}_A, \quad \sum_{\tilde{k}_2 \neq 1} (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{k_2}^B (\Pi^B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \preceq \text{I}_B$$

and the operator inequality

$$P \otimes Q = \frac{1}{2} P \otimes Q + \frac{1}{2} P \otimes Q \preceq \frac{1}{2} \text{I} \otimes Q + \frac{1}{2} P \otimes \text{I},$$

for hermitian operators $P, Q \preceq I$; (b) follows from Hayashi-Nagaoka inequality (Fact 9), (c) follows from the definition of Π^A, Π^B and the choice of r_A, r_B . This implies that $\frac{1}{2^{r_A+r_B}} \sum_{j_2, k_2} p_{j_2, k_2} |j_2, k_2\rangle \geq 1 - 6\varepsilon_2^2$.

Thus, $F^2(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mu_{(1,1)}^{(2)}), \mu_{(1,1)}^{(4)}) \geq (1 - 6\varepsilon_2^2)^2 \geq 1 - 12\varepsilon_2^2$. Since $\mu_{(1,1)}^{(3)} = \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mu_{(1,1)}^{(2)})$, the claim follows. $\square$

This shows that protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ succeeds with fidelity squared as given in the claim. Now we proceed to construct the actual protocol.

3. Actual protocol: Consider the state,

$$\xi_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \sigma_{M_1} \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{2R_A+r_A}} \otimes \omega_{N_1} \dots \otimes \omega_{N_{2R_B+r_B}}.$$

Let

$$|\theta\rangle = |\sigma\rangle_{M'_1 M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{M'_{2R_A+r_A} M_{2R_A+r_A}} \otimes |\omega\rangle_{N'_1 N_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |\omega\rangle_{N'_{2R_B+r_B} N_{2R_B+r_B}}$$

be a purification of $\sigma_{M_1} \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{2R_A+r_A}} \otimes \omega_{N_1} \dots \otimes \omega_{N_{2R_B+r_B}}$. Let

$$|\xi\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\Psi\rangle_{RABCMN} \otimes |\theta\rangle_{M'_1 \dots M'_{2R_A+r_A} N'_1 \dots N'_{2R_B+r_B} M_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}$$

be a purification of $\xi_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}$.

Using tripartite convex-split lemma (Lemma 2) and choice of $R_A + r_A, R_B + r_B$ we have,

$$F^2(\xi_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}, \mu_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}) \geq 1 - (\varepsilon_1 + 2\sqrt{\delta})^2.$$

Let $|\xi'\rangle$ be a purification of $\xi_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}$ (guaranteed by Uhlmann's theorem, Fact 3) such that,

$$F^2(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|, |\mu\rangle\langle\mu|) = F^2(\xi_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}, \mu_{RABM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} N_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}}) \geq 1 - (\varepsilon_1 + 2\sqrt{\delta})^2.$$

Let $V' : CMNM'_1 \dots M'_{2R_A+r_A} N'_1 \dots N'_{2R_B+r_B} \rightarrow JKCM'_1 \dots M'_{2R_A+r_A} N'_1 \dots N'_{2R_B+r_B}$ be an isometry (guaranteed by Uhlmann's theorem, Fact 3) such that,

$$V'|\xi\rangle = |\xi'\rangle.$$

Consider the following protocol $\mathcal{P}$.

1. Alice, Bob, Charlie and Referee start by sharing the state $|\xi\rangle$ between themselves where Alice holds registers $AM_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A}$, Bob holds the registers $BN_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B}$, Charlie holds $CMNM'_1 \dots M'_{2R_A+r_A} N'_1 \dots N'_{2R_B+r_B}$ and Referee holds the register R . Note that $|\Psi\rangle_{RABCMN}$ is provided as input to the protocol and $|\theta\rangle$ is additional shared entanglement of the form $|\theta\rangle = |\theta_1\rangle \otimes |\theta_2\rangle$, with $|\theta_1\rangle$ shared between (Alice, Charlie) in registers $E_{AC} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M_1 M'_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} M'_{2R_A+r_A}$ and $|\theta_2\rangle$ shared between (Bob, Charlie) in registers $E_{BC} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N_1 N'_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B} N'_{2R_B+r_B}$.
2. Charlie applies isometry V' to obtain state $|\xi'\rangle$.
3. Alice, Bob and Charlie simulate protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ from its Step 2.
4. After the protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ finishes, Alice and Bob introduce registers M, N in the states $|0\rangle_M, |0\rangle_N$ respectively. Controlled on $|j_1, j_2\rangle_{J'_1 J'_2}$, Alice swaps the registers M_j and M (where $j = (j_1 - 1) \cdot 2^{r_A} + j_2$). Similarly, controlled on $|k_1, k_2\rangle_{K'_1 K'_2}$, Bob swaps the registers M_k and M (where $k = (k_1 - 1) \cdot 2^{r_B} + k_2$).

Let E'_{AC} represent the registers $J_1 J_2 J'_1 J'_2 M_1 M'_1 \dots M_{2R_A+r_A} M'_{2R_A+r_A}$ and E'_{BC} represent the registers $K_1 K_2 K'_1 K'_2 N_1 N'_1 \dots N_{2R_B+r_B} N'_{2R_B+r_B}$ (we have ignored the additional registers involved in superdense coding scheme in protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$, as they are always independent of the global state). Let $\Phi_{RABCMNE'_{AC}E'_{BC}}$ be the output of protocol $\mathcal{P}$.

If Step 4 of the protocol $\mathcal{P}$ acted on the state $|\mu^{(4)}\rangle$, the resulting global state would be

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mu^{(5)}\rangle &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+r_A} 2^{R_B+r_B}}} \sum_{j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2} |j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2\rangle_{J_1 J_2 K_1 K_2} \otimes |j_1, k_1, j_2, k_2\rangle_{J'_1 K'_1 J'_2 K'_2} \\
&\quad \otimes |\Psi\rangle_{RBACMN} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle_{M'_j M_j} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle_{N'_k N_k} \\
&= |\Psi\rangle_{RBACMN} \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_A+r_A}}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} |j_1, j_2\rangle_{J_1 J_2} |j_1, j_2\rangle_{J'_1 J'_2} \otimes |\sigma^{-j}\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle_{M'_j M_j} \right) \\
&\quad \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{R_B+r_B}}} \sum_{k_1, k_2} |k_1, k_2\rangle_{K_1 K_2} |k_1, k_2\rangle_{K'_1 K'_2} \otimes |\omega^{-k}\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle_{N'_k N_k} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is of the form $|\Psi\rangle_{RBACMN} \otimes |\theta'_1\rangle_{E'_{AC}} \otimes |\theta'_2\rangle_{E'_{BC}}$. Now, the entire protocol $\mathcal{P}$ can be viewed as a quantum map from input to output. Using the monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operation (Fact 2), claim 1 and triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1) we conclude that

$$P(\mu^{(5)}, \Phi_{RABCMNE'_{AC}E'_{BC}}) \leq P(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|, |\mu\rangle\langle\mu|) + P(\mu^{(3)}, \mu^{(4)}) \leq \varepsilon_1 + 2\sqrt{\delta} + 4\varepsilon_2.$$

This is equivalent to the statement

$$P(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RBACMN} \otimes |\theta'_1\rangle\langle\theta'_1|_{E'_{AC}} \otimes |\theta'_2\rangle\langle\theta'_2|_{E'_{BC}}, \Phi_{RABCMNE'_{AC}E'_{BC}}) \leq \varepsilon_1 + 2\sqrt{\delta} + 4\varepsilon_2.$$

The number of qubits communicated by Charlie to Alice and Charlie to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is equal to the number of qubits communicated in $\mathcal{P}_1$. This is $\frac{R_A}{2}$ and $\frac{R_B}{2}$ respectively. This completes the proof. $\square$

Achievable rate region for Task 1

Theorem 2. Fix $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta > 0$. Let Alice (AM), Bob (BN), Referee (R) and Charlie (C) share the pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RAMBNC}$. There exists an entanglement assisted quantum protocol, with entanglement shared only between (Alice, Charlie) and (Bob, Charlie), such that at the end of the protocol, Alice (A), Bob (B), Referee (R) and Charlie (CMN) share the state Φ'_{RAMBNC} with the property that $P(\Phi', |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \leq \varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2 + 2\sqrt{\delta}$. The number of qubits that Alice sends to Charlie is $R_{A \rightarrow C}$ and that Bob sends to Charlie is $R_{B \rightarrow C}$, where the pair $(R_{A \rightarrow C}, R_{B \rightarrow C})$ lie in the union of the following rate region: for every $\Psi'_{RAMBNC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi_{RAMBNC})$ such that $\Psi'_{RAB} \preceq 2^\delta \Psi_{RAB}$ and states σ_M, ω_N :

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{A \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RABM} \| \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \sigma_M) - D_{\text{H}}^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M) + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^2 \delta} \right), \\
R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RABN} \| \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \omega_N) - D_{\text{H}}^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \omega_N) + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^2 \delta} \right), \\
R_{A \rightarrow C} + R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RABMN} \| \Psi_{RAB} \otimes \sigma_M \otimes \omega_N) - D_{\text{H}}^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{AM} \| \Psi_A \otimes \sigma_M) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - D_{\text{H}}^{\varepsilon_2^2}(\Psi_{BN} \| \Psi_B \otimes \omega_N) + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^2 \delta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider the protocol $\mathcal{P}$ as obtained in Theorem 1 for the Task 2, with the starting state $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RAMBNC} \otimes |\theta_1\rangle\langle\theta_1|_{E_{AC}} \otimes |\theta_2\rangle\langle\theta_2|_{E_{BC}}$ (where θ_1 and θ_2 serve as pre-shared entanglement) and the final state $\Phi_{RAMBNC E'_{AC} E'_{BC}}$. Furthermore, as promised by Theorem 1, there exist states $|\theta'_1\rangle_{E'_{AC}}$ and $|\theta'_2\rangle_{E'_{BC}}$ such that

$$P(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \otimes |\theta'_1\rangle\langle\theta'_1| \otimes |\theta'_2\rangle\langle\theta'_2|) \leq \varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2 + 2\sqrt{\delta}.$$

Since the protocol can be viewed as a unitary by Charlie, followed by quantum communication from Charlie to Alice and Bob and then subsequent unitaries by Alice and Bob, this protocol can be reversed to obtain a protocol $\mathcal{P}'$. We take $\mathcal{P}'$ as the desired protocol for above task and let $\Phi'_{RABCMNE_{AC}E_{BC}}$ be the state

obtained by running $\mathcal{P}'$ on $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \otimes |\theta'_1\rangle\langle\theta'_1| \otimes |\theta'_2\rangle\langle\theta'_2|$ (where $|\Psi\rangle$ serves as input to the protocol, $|\theta'_1\rangle$ serves as the shared entanglement between (Alice, Charlie) and $|\theta'_2\rangle$ serves as the shared entanglement between (Bob, Charlie)). From the relation $\mathcal{P}'(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \otimes |\theta_1\rangle\langle\theta_1| \otimes |\theta_2\rangle\langle\theta_2|$ and the monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations (Fact 2), we conclude

$$P(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \otimes |\theta_1\rangle\langle\theta_1| \otimes |\theta_2\rangle\langle\theta_2|, \Phi') \leq \varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2 + 2\sqrt{\delta}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

4 Rate region in the asymptotic setting

In this section, we re-derive the result of [2], but without the use of time-sharing. Consider the asymptotic version of Task 1 (Section 3) in the special case where register C is trivial, i.e., the joint state between Alice, Bob and Reference is the n -fold tensor product of the state $|\Psi\rangle_{RABMN}$. Using Theorem 2 (with $\sigma_M \rightarrow \Psi_M, \omega_N \rightarrow \Psi_N$), Theorem 3 (in Appendix B) for the pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RABMN}$ and Fact 11, we conclude that the rate pair $(R_{A \rightarrow C}, R_{B \rightarrow C})$ is asymptotically achievable for Task 1, if they satisfy the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} (I(RAB : M)_\Psi - I(A : M)_\Psi), \\ R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} (I(RAB : N)_\Psi - I(B : N)_\Psi), \\ R_{A \rightarrow C} + R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} (I(RAB : M : N)_\Psi - I(A : M)_\Psi - I(B : N)_\Psi). \end{aligned}$$

Quantum version of the rate region obtained by Slepian and Wolf: An immediate corollary of above rate region is the following. Consider the task in [2], which is a quantum version of the Slepian-Wolf protocol [1]. Alice (M^n), Bob (N^n), Referee (R^n) share the joint pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RMN}^{\otimes n}$. Alice and Bob wish to communicate their registers M^n and N^n to Charlie such that the final state shared between Referee (R^n) and Charlie ($M^n N^n$) is $\Phi_{R^n M^n N^n}^{\otimes n}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\Psi_{RMN}^{\otimes n}, \Phi_{R^n M^n N^n}^{\otimes n}) = 0$. To accomplish this task, there exists an entanglement assisted protocol (with entanglement shared between (Alice, Charlie) and (Bob, Charlie)) if the amount of communication from Alice to Charlie ($R_{A \rightarrow C}$) and Bob to Charlie ($R_{B \rightarrow C}$) satisfy the following constraints

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} I(R : M)_\Psi, \\ R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} I(R : N)_\Psi, \\ R_{A \rightarrow C} + R_{B \rightarrow C} &\geq \frac{1}{2} I(R : M : N)_\Psi. \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgment

This work is supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation, through the Tier 3 Grant Random numbers from quantum processes MOE2012-T3-1-009 and NRF RF Award NRF-NRFF2013-13.

References

- [1] D. Slepian and J. Wolf, “Noiseless coding of correlated information sources,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 19, pp. 471–480, Jul 1973.
- [2] A. Abeyesinghe, I. Devetak, P. Hayden, and A. Winter, “The mother of all protocols: restructuring quantum information’s family tree,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 465, no. 2108, pp. 2537–2563, 2009.
- [3] I. Devetak and J. Yard, “Exact cost of redistributing multipartite quantum states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 100, no. 230501, 2008.

- [4] C. E. Shannon, “A mathematical theory of communication,” *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 27, pp. 379–423, July 1948.
- [5] B. Schumacher, “Quantum coding,” *Phys. Rev. A.*, vol. 51, pp. 2738–2747, 1995.
- [6] P. Harsha, R. Jain, D. McAllester, and J. Radhakrishnan, “The communication complexity of correlation,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 438–449, 2010.
- [7] M. Braverman and A. Rao, “Information equals amortized communication,” in *Proceedings of the 52nd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS ’11, (Washington, DC, USA), pp. 748–757, IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [8] D. Touchette, “Quantum information complexity,” in *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’15, (New York, NY, USA), pp. 317–326, ACM, 2015.
- [9] M. Berta, “Single-shot quantum state merging.” Master’s thesis, ETH Zurich, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.4495>, 2009.
- [10] M. Berta, M. Christandl, and R. Renner, “The Quantum Reverse Shannon Theorem based on one-shot information theory,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 306, no. 3, pp. 579–615, 2011.
- [11] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, “Quantum state merging and negative information,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 269, no. 1, pp. 107–136, 2007.
- [12] M. Berta, M. Christandl, and D. Touchette, “Smooth entropy bounds on one-shot quantum state redistribution.” <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4338>, 2014.
- [13] A. Anshu, V. Devabathini, and R. Jain, “Near optimal bounds on quantum communication complexity of single-shot quantum state redistribution.” <http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.3031>, 2014.
- [14] A. Anshu, R. Jain, and N. Warsi, “Smooth min-max relative entropy based bounds for one-shot classical and quantum state redistribution.” <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.02396>, 2017.
- [15] J. T. Yard and I. Devetak, “Optimal quantum source coding with quantum side information at the encoder and decoder,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 5339–5351, 2009.
- [16] M. H. Hsieh and S. Watanabe, “Fully quantum source compression with a quantum helper,” in *2015 IEEE Information Theory Workshop - Fall (ITW)*, pp. 307–311, Oct 2015.
- [17] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. Wiley Series in Telecommunications, New York, NY, USA: John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- [18] A. Anshu, R. Jain, and N. Warsi, “One shot entanglement assisted classical and quantum communication over noisy quantum channels: A hypothesis testing and convex split approach.” <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.01940>, 2017.
- [19] M. Hayashi and H. Nagaoka, “General formulas for capacity of classical-quantum channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 1753–1768, July 2003.
- [20] H. Nagaoka and M. Hayashi, “An information-spectrum approach to classical and quantum hypothesis testing for simple hypotheses,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 534–549, Feb 2007.
- [21] T. S. Han and S. Verdú, “Approximation theory of output statistics,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, pp. 752–772, May 1993.
- [22] R. Renner, “Security of quantum key distribution.” PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich, Diss. ETH No. 16242, [arXiv:quant-ph/0512258](http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0512258), 2005.
- [23] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, “Duality between smooth min- and max-entropies,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4674 – 4681, 2010.
- [24] M. Tomamichel, “A framework for non-asymptotic quantum information theory.” PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich, <http://arXiv.org/abs/1203.2142>, 2012.
- [25] N. Datta, “Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 2816–2826, 2009.
- [26] M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi, “A hierarchy of information quantities for finite block length analysis of quantum tasks,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, pp. 7693–7710, Nov 2013.

- [27] H. Barnum, C. M. Cave, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. Schumacher, “Noncommuting mixed states cannot be broadcast,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 76, no. 15, pp. 2818–2821, 1996.
- [28] G. Lindblad, “Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 40, pp. 147–151, 1975.
- [29] A. Uhlmann, “The ”transition probability” in the state space of a *-algebra,” *Rep. Math. Phys.*, vol. 9, pp. 273–279, 1976.
- [30] D. Dacunha-Castelle, H. Heyer, and B. Roynette, “Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour VII,” *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, vol. 678, 1978.
- [31] A. Winter, “Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 2481–2485, 1999.
- [32] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, “A new proof of the channel coding theorem via hypothesis testing in quantum information theory,” in *Information Theory, 2002. Proceedings. 2002 IEEE International Symposium on*, pp. 73–, 2002.
- [33] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, “Communication via one- and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 69, no. 20, pp. 2881–2884, 1992.
- [34] K. Li, “Second-order asymptotics for quantum hypothesis testing,” *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 42, pp. 171–189, 02 2014.

A A variant of the convex-split lemma

In this section, we prove the tri-partite variant of convex split lemma used in the proof of Theorem 1. We shall use the following fact.

Fact 10 ([13]). *Let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n, \theta$ be quantum states and $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ be a probability distribution. Let $\mu = \sum_i p_i \mu_i$ be the average state. Then*

$$D(\mu \parallel \theta) = \sum_i p_i (D(\mu_i \parallel \theta) - D(\mu_i \parallel \mu)).$$

Using this fact, we prove the following statement.

Lemma 2 (Tri-partite convex-split lemma). *Let $\rho_{RAB} \in \mathcal{D}(RAB)$, $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\omega_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ be quantum states, $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and ρ'_{RAB} be a quantum state satisfying $\rho'_{RAB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RAB})$. For some $R_1, R_2 \geq 1$, consider the following state*

$$\tau_{RA_1 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{R_A + R_B}} \sum_{i=1}^{2^{R_A}} \sum_{j=1}^{2^{R_B}} \rho_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \sigma_{A_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{i-1}} \otimes \sigma_{A_{i+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{2^{R_A}}} \otimes \omega_{B_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{j-1}} \otimes \omega_{B_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{2^{R_B}}}$$

on registers $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{2^{R_A}}, B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{2^{R_B}}$, where $\forall i \in [2^{R_A}], j \in [2^{R_B}] : \rho_{RA_i B_j} = \rho_{RAB}$, $\rho_{RA_i} = \rho_{RA}$ and $\rho_{RB_j} = \rho_{RB}$. If

$$\begin{aligned} R_A &\geq D_{\max}(\rho'_{RA} \parallel \rho_R \otimes \sigma_A) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}, \\ R_B &\geq D_{\max}(\rho'_{RB} \parallel \rho_R \otimes \omega_B) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}, \\ R_A + R_B &\geq D_{\max}(\rho'_{RAB} \parallel \rho_R \otimes \sigma_A \otimes \omega_B) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}, \\ \rho'_R &\preceq 2^\delta \rho_R \end{aligned}$$

then

$$P(\tau_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}, \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_1} \otimes \sigma_{A_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{2^{R_A}}} \otimes \omega_{B_1} \otimes \omega_{B_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{2^{R_B}}}) \leq \varepsilon + 2\sqrt{\delta},$$

The proof closely follows the original proof of convex split lemma from [13].

Proof. For brevity, we set

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}(\rho'_{RAB} \| \rho_R \otimes \sigma_A \otimes \omega_B) \\ k_2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}(\rho'_{RA} \| \rho_R \otimes \sigma_A) \\ k_3 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}(\rho'_{RB} \| \rho_R \otimes \omega_B) \end{aligned}$$

We shall work with the state

$$\tau'_{RA_1 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \sum_{i=1}^{2^{R_A}} \sum_{j=1}^{2^{R_B}} \rho'_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \sigma_{A_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{i-1}} \otimes \sigma_{A_{i+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{2^{R_A}}} \otimes \omega_{B_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{j-1}} \otimes \omega_{B_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{2^{R_B}}}$$

Define,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-(i,j)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{A_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{i-1}} \otimes \sigma_{A_{i+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{2^{R_A}}} \otimes \omega_{B_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{j-1}} \otimes \omega_{B_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{2^{R_B}}}, \\ \rho &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{A_1} \otimes \sigma_{A_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{A_{2^{R_A}}} \otimes \omega_{B_1} \otimes \omega_{B_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{B_{2^{R_B}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\tau'_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}} = \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \sum_{i,j} \rho'_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)}.$$

Now, we use Fact 10 to express

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\tau'_{RA_1 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}} \middle\| \rho_R \otimes \rho\right) &= \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \sum_{i,j} D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \middle\| \rho_R \otimes \rho\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \sum_{i,j} D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \middle\| \tau'_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \middle\| \rho_R \otimes \rho\right) &= D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \middle\| \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}\right) \\ D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \middle\| \tau'_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}\right) &\geq D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \middle\| \tau'_{RA_i B_j}\right), \end{aligned}$$

as relative entropy decreases under partial trace. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau'_{RA_i B_j} &= \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \rho'_{RA_i B_j} + \frac{1}{2^{R_A}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{R_B}}\right) \rho'_{RA_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j} + \frac{1}{2^{R_A}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{R_B}}\right) \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \rho'_{RB_j} \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{R_A}} - \frac{1}{2^{R_B}} + \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}}\right) \rho'_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption,

$$\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \preceq 2^{k_1} \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}, \quad \rho'_{RA_i} \preceq 2^{k_2} \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i}, \quad \rho'_{RB_j} \preceq 2^{k_3} \rho_R \otimes \omega_{B_j}, \quad \rho'_R \preceq 2^\delta \rho_R.$$

Hence

$$\tau'_{RA_i B_j} \preceq \left(2^\delta + \frac{2^{k_2}}{2^{R_A}} + \frac{2^{k_3}}{2^{R_B}} + \frac{2^{k_1}}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}}\right) \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}.$$

Since $\log(A) \preceq \log(B)$ if $A \preceq B$ for positive semi-definite matrices A and B , we have

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \middle\| \tau'_{RA_i B_j}\right) &= \text{Tr}(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \log \rho'_{RA_i B_j}) - \text{Tr}(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \log \tau'_{RA_i B_j}) \\ &\geq \text{Tr}(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \log \rho'_{RA_i B_j}) - \text{Tr}(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \log(\rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j})) - \log\left(2^\delta + \frac{2^{k_2}}{2^{R_A}} + \frac{2^{k_3}}{2^{R_B}} + \frac{2^{k_1}}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}}\right) \\ &= D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \middle\| \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}\right) - \log\left(2^\delta + \frac{2^{k_2}}{2^{R_A}} + \frac{2^{k_3}}{2^{R_B}} + \frac{2^{k_1}}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using in Equation 1, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
D\left(\tau'_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}} \parallel \rho_R \otimes \rho\right) &\leq \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \sum_{i,j} D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \parallel \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}\right) \\
&- \frac{1}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}} \sum_{i,j} D\left(\rho'_{RA_i B_j} \parallel \rho_R \otimes \sigma_{A_i} \otimes \omega_{B_j}\right) \\
&+ \log\left(2^\delta + \frac{2^{k_2}}{2^{R_A}} + \frac{2^{k_3}}{2^{R_B}} + \frac{2^{k_1}}{2^{R_A} \cdot 2^{R_B}}\right) \leq \log(1 + \delta + 3\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Above, the last inequality follows by the lower bound on $2^{R_A}, 2^{R_B}$ and the fact that $\delta < 1$. Thus, by Pinsker's inequality (Fact 4), we obtain that

$$P(\tau'_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}, \rho_R \otimes \rho) \leq \sqrt{4\delta}.$$

Since $P(\tau'_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}, \tau_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}) \leq P(\rho'_{AB}, \rho_{AB}) \leq \varepsilon$, triangle inequality for Purified distance (Fact 1) shows that

$$P(\tau_{RA_1 A_2 \dots A_{2^{R_A}} B_1 B_2 \dots B_{2^{R_B}}}, \rho_R \otimes \rho) \leq \varepsilon + 2\sqrt{\delta}.$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

B Asymptotic analysis

An important property of smooth information theoretic quantities is that in asymptotic setting, they converge to relative entropy based quantities. In this section, we show this property for the one-shot bounds we obtain in Theorem 2, in the case where register C is absent.

Following fact ensures that smooth max-relative entropy and smooth min-relative entropy converge asymptotically to suitable quantities.

Fact 11 ([26, 34]). *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and n be an integer. Let $\rho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}$ be quantum states. Define $V(\rho \parallel \sigma) = \text{Tr}(\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)^2) - (D(\rho \parallel \sigma))^2$ and $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx$. It holds that*

$$D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho^{\otimes n} \parallel \sigma^{\otimes n}) = nD(\rho \parallel \sigma) + \sqrt{nV(\rho \parallel \sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n),$$

and

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho^{\otimes n} \parallel \sigma^{\otimes n}) = nD(\rho \parallel \sigma) + \sqrt{nV(\rho \parallel \sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n).$$

Following is an important fact.

Fact 12 (Lemma 12 and Proposition 13, [26]). *For quantum state $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ and reals $0 < \delta < 1 - \varepsilon^2$, it holds that*

$$D_s^{1-\varepsilon^2-\delta}(\rho_A \parallel \sigma_A) - 2\log \frac{1}{\delta} - 2 \leq D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \parallel \sigma_A) \leq D_s^{1-\varepsilon^2+\delta}(\rho_A \parallel \sigma_A) + \log v(\sigma) + 2\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta},$$

where $v(\sigma_A)$ is the number of distinct eigenvectors of σ_A . It also holds that

$$\tilde{D}_s^{\varepsilon^2+\delta}(\rho_A \parallel \sigma_A) - 2\log \frac{1}{\delta} - 2 \leq D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \parallel \sigma_A).$$

Proof. The first part is essentially that given in [26] (Proposition 13 and Lemma 12). For the second part, we note that the proof in [26] (Proposition 12, Equation 23) directly proceeds for this case as well: setting $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \parallel \sigma_A)$, it is shown that for any $\delta' > 0$, it holds that

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^{R+\delta'} \sigma_A\}_-) \geq (\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} - 2^{-\delta'/2})^2.$$

Setting $\delta' = \log \frac{1}{\delta}$ proves the inequality. $\square$

Following Claim is an immediate corollary of above Fact.

Fact 13. For quantum states $\rho_A, \rho'_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\sigma_A, \sigma'_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ and reals $1 > \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1 > 0$, following properties hold.

1. If $\rho'_A \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A)$, then

$$D_s^{1-\varepsilon-3\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A) \leq D_s^{1-\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) + \log v(\sigma) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}$$

and

$$\tilde{D}_s^{\varepsilon+3\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A) \leq D_s^{1-\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) + \log v(\sigma) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}.$$

2.

$$\tilde{D}_s^{4\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma'_A) \leq D_s^{1-\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) + D_{\max}(\sigma_A \| \sigma'_A) + \log v(\sigma) + 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}.$$

Proof. The items are proved as follows.

1. Consider the following series of inequalities, which follow by application of Fact 12 and the observation that $D_{\max}^\delta(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \geq D_{\max}^{\delta+\varepsilon}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A)$ for any $\delta > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} D_s^{1-\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) &\geq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{2\varepsilon_1}}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) - \log v(\sigma) - 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1} \\ &\geq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{2\varepsilon_1}+\varepsilon}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A) - \log v(\sigma) - 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1} \\ &\geq D_s^{1-3\varepsilon_1^2-\varepsilon^2}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A) - \log v(\sigma) - 8 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Second expression of the item follows similarly.

2. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}(\sigma_A \| \sigma'_A)$. Consider the following series of inequalities, which follow by application of Fact 12 and Fact 5.

$$\begin{aligned} D_s^{1-\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) &\geq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{2\varepsilon_1}}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) - \log v(\sigma) - 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1} \\ &\geq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{2\varepsilon_1}}(\rho_A \| \sigma'_A) - k - \log v(\sigma) - 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1} \\ &\geq \tilde{D}_s^{4\varepsilon_1^2}(\rho_A \| \sigma'_A) - k - \log v(\sigma) - 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Following two facts are about some special properties of information spectrum relative entropy.

Fact 14. Let $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ be quantum states such that $\rho_A \in \text{supp}(\Pi_A)$ for some projector Π_A that commutes with σ_A . Then it holds that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) = D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \Pi_A \sigma_A \Pi_A).$$

Proof. For any $k > 0$, it holds that

$$\rho_A - 2^k \sigma_A = \Pi_A \rho_A \Pi_A - 2^k \Pi_A \sigma_A \Pi_A - 2^k (\mathbb{I}_A - \Pi_A) \sigma_A (\mathbb{I}_A - \Pi_A).$$

Thus,

$$\{\rho_A - 2^k \sigma_A\}_+ = \{\Pi_A \rho_A \Pi_A - 2^k \Pi_A \sigma_A \Pi_A\}_+ = \{\rho_A - 2^k \Pi_A \sigma_A \Pi_A\}_+.$$

This completes the proof by using the definition of information spectrum relative entropy. □

Fact 15. Let $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ be a pure quantum state and μ_A be the maximally mixed state on register A . Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \mu_A) = D_{\max}(\rho_A \| \mu_A).$$

Proof. By definition, we have $D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \mu_A) = \sup R : \text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \mu_A\}_+) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Now the projector $\{\rho_A - 2^R \mu_A\}_+$ contains the support of ρ_A if $R < \log \dim(A)$ and otherwise is a null projector. The constraint $\text{Tr}(\rho_A \{\rho_A - 2^R \mu_A\}_+) \geq 1 - \varepsilon > 0$ requires that $\{\rho_A - 2^R \mu_A\}_+$ be a non-null projector. This implies that $D_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \mu_A) = \log \dim(A)$, which is equal to the value of $D_{\max}(\rho_A \| \mu_A)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We shall also need the well known Chernoff bounds.

Fact 16 (Chernoff bounds). Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be independent random variables, with each $X_i \in [0, 1]$ always. Let $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_1 + \dots + X_n$ and $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}X = \mathbb{E}X_1 + \dots + \mathbb{E}X_n$. Then for any $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X \geq (1 + \varepsilon)\mu) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{3}\mu\right) \\ \Pr(X \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\mu\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we proceed to the main result of this section, which shows that given a pure state ρ , one can find a pure state ψ close to ρ that satisfies several constraints on the max-relative entropy.

Theorem 3. Let $\rho_{RMN} \in \mathcal{D}(RMN)$ be a pure quantum state. Fix an integer n and $\delta < 1/6000$ such that:

$$n > 10^5 \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\log(1/\lambda_{\min}(\rho_M))}{S(\rho_M) \cdot \delta^3}, \frac{\log(1/\lambda_{\min}(\rho_N))}{S(\rho_N) \cdot \delta^3}, \frac{\log(1/\lambda_{\min}(\rho_R))}{S(\rho_R) \cdot \delta^3} \right\}.$$

Then there exists a pure quantum state $\psi_{R^n M^n N^n}$ such that

1. $P(\psi_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho_{RMN}^{\otimes n}) \leq 60\sqrt{\delta}$.
2. $\psi_{R^n} < (1 + 2000\delta)\rho_R^{\otimes n}$.
3. $D_{\max}(\psi_{R^n N^n} \| \rho_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_N^{\otimes n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{RN}^{\otimes n} \| \rho_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_N^{\otimes n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + O(\log n)$.
4. $D_{\max}(\psi_{R^n M^n} \| \rho_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_M^{\otimes n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{RM}^{\otimes n} \| \rho_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_M^{\otimes n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + O(\log n)$.
5. $D_{\max}(\psi_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \rho_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_M^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_N^{\otimes n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{RMN}^{\otimes n} \| \rho_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_M^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_N^{\otimes n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + O(\log n)$.

Proof. Our proof is divided into three main steps, as we elucidate below.

Typical projection onto subsystems A, B : For brevity, we set $\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho_{RMN}^{\otimes n}$. Let Π_{R^n} be the projector onto the eigenvectors of ρ_{R^n} with eigenvalues in the range $[(1 - \delta)2^{-n \cdot S(\rho_R)}, (1 + \delta)2^{-n \cdot S(\rho_R)}]$. Similarly, define Π_{M^n}, Π_{N^n} . Let $\mu_{R^n}, \mu_{M^n}, \mu_{N^n}$ be uniform distributions in the support of $\Pi_{R^n}, \Pi_{M^n}, \Pi_{N^n}$ respectively. Following relations are easy to observe.

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \delta)\Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} &\preceq \mu_{R^n} \preceq (1 + \delta)\Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \preceq (1 + \delta)\rho_{R^n} \\ (1 - \delta)\Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} &\preceq \mu_{M^n} \preceq (1 + \delta)\Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} \preceq (1 + \delta)\rho_{M^n} \\ (1 - \delta)\Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n} &\preceq \mu_{N^n} \preceq (1 + \delta)\Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n} \preceq (1 + \delta)\rho_{N^n}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Using Chernoff bounds (Fact 16), we have that $\text{Tr}(\Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n}) \geq 1 - 2 \cdot \exp(-\frac{\delta^2 \cdot n \cdot S(\rho_R)}{\log(1/\lambda_{\min}(\rho_R))}) \geq 1 - \delta$ for the choice of n . Similarly, $\text{Tr}(\Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n}) \geq 1 - \delta$ and $\text{Tr}(\Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n}) \geq 1 - \delta$.

Now, define the state

$$\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}) \rho_{R^n M^n N^n} (\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n})}{\text{Tr}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} (\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}))}.$$

We will establish the following claims about $\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n}$.

Claim 2. It holds that

1. $F^2(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho_{R^n M^n N^n}) \geq 1 - 64\delta$.

2. $\text{Tr}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n}(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n})) \geq 1 - 64\delta$.
3. $\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \in \text{supp}(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n})$.
4. $\rho'_{R^n} \preceq \frac{1}{1-64\delta} \rho_{R^n}, \rho'_{M^n} \preceq \frac{1}{1-64\delta} \rho_{M^n}, \rho'_{N^n} \preceq \frac{1}{1-64\delta} \rho_{N^n}$.

Proof. We prove each item in a sequence below.

1. This is a straightforward application of Gentle measurement lemma (Fact 7) and Fact 8.
2. This follows along similar lines as argued above.
3. This follows since $(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}) \rho_{R^n M^n N^n} (\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}) \preceq \Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}$.
4. We proceed as follows for ρ'_{R^n} .

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho'_{R^n} &= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n}(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}))} \text{Tr}_{M^n N^n}((\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}) \rho_{R^n M^n N^n} (\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n})) \\
&= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n}(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}))} \text{Tr}_{M^n N^n}((\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}) \rho_{R^n M^n N^n} ((\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M^n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N^n}))) \\
&\preceq \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n}(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}))} \text{Tr}_{M^n N^n}((\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M^n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N^n}) \rho_{R^n M^n N^n} ((\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M^n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N^n}))) \\
&= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n}(\Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n}))} \Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \preceq \frac{1}{1-64\delta} \rho_{R^n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Last inequality is due to Item 2 above and the fact that Π_{R^n} is a projector onto certain eigenspace of ρ_{R^n} . Same argument holds for ρ_{M^n} and ρ_{N^n} . $\square$

Switching to information spectrum relative entropy: Using above claim, we now proceed to second step of our proof. As a corollary from the Claim (Item 1), along with Fact 12, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
D_s^{1-90\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) - 2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} &\leq D_{\max}^{9\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) \\
&\leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}). \quad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

Fact 14 implies that

$$D_s^{1-90\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) = D_s^{1-90\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n}).$$

Let $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v(\Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n})$, which is the number of distinct eigenvalues of $\Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n}$. We apply Fact 13 along with Equation 2 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&D_s^{1-90\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n}) \\
&\geq \tilde{D}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) - 2 \log \frac{1}{1-\delta} - \log v - 5 \log \frac{1}{\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Equation 3, we conclude that

$$\tilde{D}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v. \quad (4)$$

In the same way, we can argue that

$$\tilde{D}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n} \| \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v. \quad (5)$$

and

$$\tilde{D}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{R^n N^n} \| \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n N^n} \| \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v. \quad (6)$$

Removing large eigenvalues from a subsystem: Let k be the minimum achieved in $\tilde{D}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n} \| \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n})$.

For brevity, set $\Pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho'_{R^n M^n} - 2^k \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}\}_-$ and define the state

$$\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \Pi'}{\text{Tr}(\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n N^n})}.$$

It holds that $\text{Tr}(\Pi' \rho'_{A^n B^n}) \geq 1 - 400\delta$. We prove the following properties for $\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}$.

Claim 3. *It holds that*

1. $P(\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho_{R^n M^n N^n}) \leq 30\sqrt{\delta}$.
2. $\rho''_{R^n} \preceq (1+1000\delta)\rho_{R^n}, \rho''_{M^n} \preceq (1+1000\delta)\rho_{M^n}, \rho''_{N^n} \preceq (1+1000\delta)\rho_{N^n}$. Furthermore, $\rho''_{R^n} \in \text{supp}(\Pi_{R^n})$, $\rho''_{M^n} \in \text{supp}(\Pi_{M^n})$ and $\rho''_{N^n} \in \text{supp}(\Pi_{N^n})$.
3. $D_{\max}(\rho''_{R^n M^n} \parallel \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n} \parallel \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n}) + 9 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.
4. $\tilde{D}_s^{1300\delta}(\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n} \parallel \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \parallel \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.
 $\tilde{D}_s^{1300\delta}(\rho''_{R^n N^n} \parallel \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n N^n} \parallel \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.

Proof. We prove the items in the respective sequence.

1. From Gentle measurement lemma 7, we have that $F^2(\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho'_{R^n M^n N^n}) \geq \text{Tr}(\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n N^n}) \geq 1 - 400\delta$. Using Claim 2 (Item 1) and triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1), we obtain that $P(\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho_{R^n M^n N^n}) \leq 30\sqrt{\delta}$.
2. Since $\mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}$ is uniform in the support of $\rho'_{R^n M^n}$, $\rho'_{R^n M^n}$ commutes with $\mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}$. This immediately implies that Π' commutes with $\rho'_{R^n M^n}$. Thus, we conclude that

$$\rho''_{R^n M^n} = \frac{\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n} \Pi'}{\text{Tr}(\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n})} \preceq \frac{\rho'_{R^n M^n}}{1 - 400\delta},$$

where the inequality follows from the relation $\text{Tr}(\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n}) \geq 1 - 400\delta$.

Invoking Claim 2 (Item 4), we obtain

$$\rho''_{R^n} \preceq \frac{\rho'_{R^n}}{1 - 400\delta} \preceq \frac{\rho_{R^n}}{(1 - 400\delta)(1 - 10\delta)} \preceq \frac{\rho_{R^n}}{1 - 410\delta}.$$

Similarly, we obtain $\rho''_{M^n} \preceq \frac{\rho_{M^n}}{1 - 410\delta}$. The inequality $\rho''_{N^n} \preceq \frac{\rho_{N^n}}{1 - 400\delta}$ follows from the fact that Π' does not act on register N^n . First part of the item now follows since $\frac{1}{1 - 410\delta} < 1 + 1000\delta$ for the choice of δ .

For the second part, we use the fact that $\rho'_{R^n} \in \text{supp}(\Pi_{R^n})$ and the relation $\rho''_{R^n} \preceq \frac{\rho'_{R^n}}{1 - 400\delta}$ established above. Same argument holds for $\rho''_{M^n}, \rho''_{N^n}$.

3. By definition of Π' , we have that

$$\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n} \Pi' \preceq 2^k \Pi' \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \Pi' \preceq 2^k \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n},$$

where last inequality holds since $\mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}$ is uniform and Π' is in its support. Thus,

$$\rho''_{R^n M^n} = \frac{\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n} \Pi'}{\text{Tr}(\Pi' \rho'_{R^n M^n})} \preceq \frac{2^k}{1 - 400\delta} \cdot \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}.$$

From Equation 2, this further implies that

$$\rho''_{R^n M^n} \preceq \frac{(1 + \delta)^2 \cdot 2^k}{1 - 400\delta} \cdot \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n}.$$

This proves the item after using Equation 5 to upper bound k .

4. Applying Fact 6, we conclude from Equation 4 that

$$D_s^{1-400\delta}(\rho'_{R^n M^n N^n} \parallel \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \parallel \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v.$$

Now we use Fact 13 along with the Item 1 above, which says that $P(\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho_{R^n M^n N^n}) \leq 30\sqrt{\delta}$, to conclude that

$$\tilde{D}_s^{1300\delta}(\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n} \parallel \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \parallel \rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 8 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v.$$

Second expression in this item follows similarly using Equation 6.

□

Removing large eigenvalues from another subsystem: Let k' be the minimum achieved in $\tilde{D}_s^{1300\delta}(\rho''_{R^n N^n} \|\mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n})$. For brevity, set $\Pi'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho''_{R^n N^n} - 2^{k'} \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}\}_-$ and define the state

$$\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\Pi'' \rho''_{R^n M^n N^n} \Pi''}{\text{Tr}(\Pi'' \rho''_{R^n M^n N^n})}.$$

It holds that $\text{Tr}(\Pi'' \rho''_{A^n B^n}) \geq 1 - 1300\delta$. We prove the following properties for $\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n}$.

Claim 4. *It holds that*

1. $P(\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n}, \rho_{R^n M^n N^n}) \leq 60\sqrt{\delta}$.
2. $\rho'''_{R^n} \preceq (1 + 2000\delta)\rho_{R^n}$.
3. $D_{\max}(\rho'''_{R^n N^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n N^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.
4. $D_{\max}(\rho'''_{R^n M^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.
5. $D_{\max}(\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.

Proof. We prove each item as follows.

1. This follows similarly along the lines of Item 1 in Claim 3.
2. This follows similarly along the lines of Item 2 in Claim 3.
3. This follows similarly along the lines of Item 3 in Claim 3 and also uses Item 4 of Claim 3.
4. We note that the projector Π'' commutes with $\rho''_{R^n N^n}$ and belongs to its support. Since $\rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}$ is a pure state, there exists a dual projector $\tilde{\Pi}$ acting on register M^n that belongs to the support of ρ''_{M^n} and commutes with ρ''_{M^n} such that $\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi} \rho''_{R^n M^n N^n}) = \text{Tr}(\Pi'' \rho''_{R^n M^n N^n})$ and $\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n} = \frac{\tilde{\Pi} \rho''_{R^n M^n N^n} \tilde{\Pi}}{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi} \rho''_{R^n M^n N^n})}$.

Thus, we find

$$\rho'''_{R^n M^n} \preceq \frac{\tilde{\Pi} \rho''_{R^n M^n} \tilde{\Pi}}{1 - 1300\delta} \preceq \frac{2^k \tilde{\Pi} \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \tilde{\Pi}}{1 - 1700\delta} = \frac{2^k \mu_{R^n} \otimes \tilde{\Pi} \mu_{M^n} \tilde{\Pi}}{1 - 1700\delta} \preceq \frac{2^k \mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n}}{1 - 1700\delta}.$$

Above, the second inequality is immediate from the definition of $\rho''_{R^n M^n}$ (and also appears in the proof of Item 3, Claim 3). Last inequality follows from the observation that $\tilde{\Pi}$ is in the support of ρ''_{M^n} and hence in the support of Π_{M^n} , as implied by Claim 3 (Item 2). This ensures that $\tilde{\Pi}$ is in the support of μ_{M^n} . The item concludes by using Equation 2.

5. From Claim 3 (Item 4), and Fact 13, we conclude that

$$D_s^{1-5000\delta}(\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n} \|\mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v.$$

But observe that $\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n}$ is a pure state. Thus, from the choice of δ which ensures that $5000\delta < 1$ and Fact 15, we have that

$$D_{\max}(\rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n} \|\mu_{R^n} \otimes \mu_{M^n} \otimes \mu_{N^n}) \leq D_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{R^n M^n N^n} \|\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}) + 10 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log v.$$

The item now follows from Equation 2.

□

Now the value of v , which is the number of distinct eigenvalues of $\Pi_{R^n} \rho_{R^n} \Pi_{R^n} \otimes \Pi_{M^n} \rho_{M^n} \Pi_{M^n} \otimes \Pi_{N^n} \rho_{N^n} \Pi_{N^n}$, is upper bounded by the number of distinct eigenvalues of $\rho_{R^n} \otimes \rho_{M^n} \otimes \rho_{N^n}$. This is at most $n^{2|R|+2|M|+2|N|}$. This proves the theorem, combining with Claim 4 and setting $\psi_{R^n M^n N^n} = \rho'''_{R^n M^n N^n}$. □